

REMARKS

Claims 12-21 are currently pending in the application. Claims 12, 19, and 20 have been amended. Support for the amended claims can be located throughout the specification, for example, at page 9, line 31 to page 10, line 2. New claim 21 has been added. Support for the new claim can be located throughout the specification, for example, at the above-identified citation.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322 (Wood).

In the present invention, user login information is matched with information in an eligibility database to determine the user's eligibility for receiving a service. If the user is a valid customer or otherwise has a valid contractual relationship with an information system provider, as determined by the user eligibility determination, validation of a user's access privileges may occur. The user access privileges may determine what information and/or services a user will be given access to by the information system provider, that is, what information and/or services the user qualifies for based on the contractual information.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 12, 19, and 21 are patentable over Wood, as Wood fails to disclose each and every element of the claim. For example, Wood fails to disclose, "providing information pertaining to the contractual information to the user when said comparing results in a match," as recited in claim 12.

In contrast to the present invention, Wood does not provide a service pertaining to contractual information. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the trust level mapping of Wood is viewed as the "contractual relationship." Applicants respectfully submit that although Wood provides access to a particular enterprise application, the content of the application does not pertain to contractual information. In other words, the content of the application does not pertain to the trust levels. The application could be a word processor program, for example.

Therefore, claims 12, 19, and 21 are patentable over Wood. As dependent claims 13-18 depend from independent claim 12, dependent claims 13-18 are patentable over Wood for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is patentable over Wood, as Wood does not disclose "comparing user login data with contractual information between an information system provider and a user to determine system access privileges." In contrast to the present invention, as

the Examiner acknowledged, Wood discloses a client and security architecture. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable over Wood.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 18, 2007

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501